



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,427	09/22/2000	Wongyu Cho	M-9092 US	1953

7590 06/23/2004
RONALD S HENDERSON
BARNES & THORNBURG
11 SOUTH MERIDIAN STREET
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204

EXAMINER

HOANG, THAI D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2667	10

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/668,427

Applicant(s)

CHO ET AL.

Examiner

Thai D Hoang

Art Unit

2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Application filed on 09/22/2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-26.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-4 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable by Pardo, US Patent No. 6,266,539 B1.

Regarding claims 1-2 and 15, Pardo discloses a telephone docking station for personal digital assistant (PDA). Pardo teaches that the PDA could be able to access to a web browser, and download a web page document, such as Yellow Page, associated with the web browser; abstract, col. 3, lines 15-16, 36-38; col. 4, lines 56-61; col. 6, lines 8-10, 31-35; col. 9, lines 5-8. Pardo teaches that the PDA dials directly from the web page: when the web browser detects a string of numbers that looks like a telephone number the string of numbers is automatically converted to a link in URL format. This

link points to an internal callback function in the PDA software that performs the dialing if the user selects the link; col. 6, lines 51-56.

Regarding claim 3, Pardo teaches a software installed on the PDA implements desired communications functions, such as the receipt and transmission of email, provides the ability to access electronic networks, such as the Internet, e.g. to browse the World Wide Web, to allow dialing from the address book, from Web pages, and from email messages containing telephone numbers the PDA is installed software; col. 3, lines 34-39. It indicates that the system inherently comprises the step of launching a server side script for initiating a call.

Regarding claim 4, the system disclosed by Pardo inherently comprises the step of checking whether the user has logged into service or not for placing a call connection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pardo, US Patent No. 6,266,539 B1, in view of Bates et al., US. Patent No. 6,585,776, hereafter referred to as Pardo and Bates respectively.

Regarding claim 14, Pardo does not teaches that the user has an option to select enable and disable the step of parsing the web page for modifying the string of

Art Unit: 2667

telephone number. However, Bates discloses a computer system and method of displaying hypertext documents with internal hypertext link definitions. Bates teaches a user can set enable and disable with the internal link; abstract, col.7, lines 45-55. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the method disclosed by Bates into Pardo's system in order to improve customer service because the user has the options for selecting.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5-13 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following references are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to the application:

Schilit et al., US Patent No. 6674453 B1, "Service portal for links separated from Web content."

Cohen et al., US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0164000 A1, "System for and method of creating and browsing a voice web"

Kusuda et al., US Patent No. 6567848 B1, "System for coordinating communication between a terminal requesting connection with another terminal while

both terminals accessing one of a plurality of servers under the management of a dispatcher”


Svedberg, US Patent No. 6341128 B1, “Providing call centers with voice gateways.”

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thai D Hoang whose telephone number is (703) 305-3232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (703) 305-4378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thai Hoang


CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 6/21/08